Application No.: 10/589,024 Docket No.: 1248-0891PUS1
Reply dated January 4, 2011 Page 8 of 10

Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2010

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, 18, and 20 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 18, and 20 are independent.

Claims 15, 18, and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 1, 3-8, and 10-14 are allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 15, 16, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2003/0120742 (Ohgami) in view of GB 2,343,334 (Cho). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

The Examiner remains of the position that Cho's teaching that "poor reception information is displayed as a bar graph" teaches the claimed displaying of display information indicating that it is not possible to receive the video signal. (see "Response to Arguments" at page 4 of the Office Action).

According to the present specification, a determining means 32 detects a level of the received video signal, and determines whether or not the display apparatus is in the <u>poor signal reception</u> state in which normal reception is not carried out. In the case that the signal level of the received video signal is not greater than, for example, a signal level threshold value, the determination means determines that it is not possible to receive any signal. (specification at paragraph bridging pages 10-11).

In other words, unlike Cho, the present invention includes a step/function of detecting a level of the received video signal and a step/function of determining whether a received video signal is not being received in a normal condition, and using that determination as a criteria for determining that it is not possible to receive any signal.

Docket No.: 1248-0891PUS1 Page 9 of 10

Application No.: 10/589,024 Reply dated January 4, 2011 Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2010

Applicants have amended claims 15, 18, and 20 in order to explicitly recite a determining means and associated function/step.

Applicants submit that Cho does not disclose a determining means that detects a level of the received video signal and determines that it is not possible to receive a video signal based on a determination that the display apparatus is in a poor signal reception state, per the language as amended in claims 15, 18, and 20.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Cho and Ohgami, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every element recited in claims 15, 18, and 20. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claim 16, Applicants submit that claim 16 depends directly from independent claim 15 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claim 16 is allowable based on its dependence from claim 15. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No.: 10/589,024 Docket No.: 1248-0891PUS1
Reply dated January 4, 2011 Page 10 of 10

Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2010

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: January 4, 2011 Respectfully submitted,

By Rolet Down # 48222 Charles Gorenstein Robert Down

Registration No.: 29271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000